

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
DETROIT DIVISION**

TANISHA C. BURTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

DIVERSIFIED CONSULTANTS,
INC,

Defendant.

CIVIL COMPLAINT

CASE NO. 2:18-cv-12979

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMPLAINT

NOW COMES Tanisha C. Burton (“Plaintiff”), by and through her attorneys, Sulaiman Law Group, Ltd. (“Sulaiman”), complaining of Diversified Consultants, Inc. (“Defendant”) as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Plaintiff brings this action seeking redress for violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (“FDCPA”) pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692 and violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §227.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. Subject matter jurisdiction is conferred upon this Court by the FDCPA, TCPA, and 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1337, as the action arises under the laws of the United States.

3. The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claim under 28 U.S.C. §1367.

4. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391 as Plaintiff resides in the Eastern District of Michigan, Defendant conducts business in the Eastern District of Michigan, and Defendant maintains significant contacts within the Eastern District of Michigan.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff is a natural person over 18-years-of-age who is a “consumer” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C §1692a(3), and is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. §153(39).

6. Defendant “is a full service collection agency” that provides third-party accounts receivables management to its clients.¹ Defendant is a corporation organized under the laws of the state of Florida with its principal place of business located at 10550 Deerwood Park Boulevard, Suite 309, Jacksonville, Florida.

FACTS SUPPORTING CAUSES OF ACTION

7. On June 15, 2015, Plaintiff’s daughter Vanessa opened a Nordstrom credit card account.

8. On November 12, 2015, Vanessa made her last payment on the account.

¹ <https://www.dcicollect.com/diversified-consultants-solutions-page/>

9. Subsequently, Vanessa defaulted on the account and left a remaining balance of approximately \$462.00 (“subject debt”).

10. In February 2018, Plaintiff received a telephone call on her cellular phone, (313) XXX-7868, from Defendant in an attempt to collect the subject debt.

11. At all times relevant to the instant action, Plaintiff was the sole subscriber, owner, possessor, and operator of the cellular telephone ending in 7868.

12. Immediately after the calls began, Plaintiff answered a call from Defendant. During this call Plaintiff notified Defendant that the debt does not belong to her, that Vanessa was not available, and demanded that Defendant cease calls to her cellular phone.

13. Defendant disregarded Plaintiff’s statement about the ownership of the debt and ignored her request that the calls cease.

14. Additionally, Plaintiff *never* provided her cellular telephone number to Defendant or otherwise expressly consented to Defendant’s phone calls.²

15. Moreover, Plaintiff answered numerous calls from Defendant where she stated that she did not owe the debt, her daughter did, and requested that Defendant stop calling her.

² Upon information and belief, Defendant obtained Plaintiff’s cellular telephone number through a method known as “skip-tracing,” whereby debt collectors obtain phone numbers by conducting inquiries upon consumer credit reports or other public record searches.

16.Plaintiff's demands that Defendant's phone calls cease fell on deaf ears and Defendant continued its phone harassment campaign.

17.Notwithstanding Plaintiff's numerous requests that Defendant's collection calls cease, Defendant placed or caused to be placed no less than 11 harassing phone calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone from February 2018 through the present day, with calls taking place on back to back days, and multiple times in one day.

18.In the calls that Plaintiff did answer, Plaintiff was greeted by a noticeable period of "dead air" while Defendant's automated telephone system attempted to connect Plaintiff to a live agent.

19.Specifically, there would be an approximate 2 second pause between the time Plaintiff said "hello," and the time that a live agent introduced them self as a representative of Defendant.

20.Moreover, Plaintiff also hears what sounds to be call center noise in the background of Defendant's calls.

21.Upon information and belief, Defendant placed its calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone using an automated telephone dialing system, a system that is commonly used in the debt collection industry to collect defaulted debts.

DAMAGES

22. Defendant's harassing phone calls have severely disrupted Plaintiff's daily life and general well-being.

23. Defendant's phone harassment campaign and illegal collection activities have caused Plaintiff actual harm, including but not limited to, invasion of privacy, nuisance, intrusion upon and occupation of Plaintiff's cellular telephone capacity, wasting Plaintiff's time, the increased risk of personal injury resulting from the distraction caused by the incessant phone calls, aggravation that accompanies unsolicited telephone calls, emotional distress, mental anguish, anxiety, loss of concentration, diminished value and utility of telephone equipment and telephone subscription services, the loss of battery charge, and the per-kilowatt electricity costs required to recharge her cellular telephone as a result of increased usage of her telephone services.

24. In addition, each time Defendant placed a telephone call to Plaintiff, Defendant occupied Plaintiff's telephone number such that Plaintiff was unable to receive other phone calls.

25. Concerned about the violations of her rights and invasion of her privacy, Plaintiff was forced to seek the assistance of counsel to file this action to compel Defendant to cease its unlawful conduct.

COUNT I – VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

26.Plaintiff restates and realleges paragraphs 1 through 25 as though fully set forth herein.

27.Defendant placed or caused to be placed non-emergency calls, including but not limited to the calls referenced above, to Plaintiff’s cellular telephone using an automatic telephone dialing system (“ATDS”) without her prior consent in violation of 47 U.S.C. §227 (b)(1)(A)(iii).

28.The TCPA defines ATDS as “equipment which has the capacity...to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator; and to dial such numbers.” 47 U.S.C. §227(a)(1).

29.Upon information and belief, based on the lack of prompt human response during the phone calls in which Plaintiff answered, Defendant used an ATDS to place calls to Plaintiff’s cellular telephone.

30.Upon information and belief, the ATDS employed by Defendant transfers the call to a live agent once a human voice is detected, thus resulting in a pause after the called party speaks into the phone.

31.Plaintiff does not have any business relationship with Defendant nor has she given it permission to call her cellular phone. As such, she could not have given Defendant consent to contact her on her cellular telephone.

32. Defendant violated the TCPA by placing no less than 11 unsolicited phone calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone from February 2018 through the present day, using an ATDS without her prior consent.

33. Any prior consent, if any, was revoked by Plaintiff's numerous verbal revocations.

34. As pled above, Plaintiff was severely harmed by Defendant's collection calls to her cellular phone.

35. Upon information and belief, Defendant has no system in place to document and archive whether it has consent to contact consumers on their cellular phones.

36. Upon information and belief, Defendant knew its collection practices were in violation of the TCPA, yet continued to employ them to increase profits at Plaintiff's expense.

37. The calls placed by Defendant to Plaintiff were regarding business activities and not for emergency purposes as defined by the TCPA under 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(A)(i).

38. Defendant, through its agents, representatives, vendors, subsidiaries, and/or employees acting within the scope of their authority acted intentionally in violation of 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

39. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(B), Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for a minimum of \$500 per call. Moreover, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(C),

Defendant's willful and knowing violations of the TCPA should trigger this Honorable Court's ability to triple the damages to which Plaintiff is otherwise entitled to under 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(C).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, TANISHA C. BURTON, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter judgment in her favor as follows:

- a. Declaring that the practices complained of herein are unlawful and violate the aforementioned statutes and regulations;
- b. Awarding Plaintiff damages of at least \$500.00 per phone call and treble damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §§ 227(b)(3)(B)&(C);
- c. Enjoining Defendant from further contacting Plaintiff; and
- d. Awarding any other relief as this Honorable Court deems just and appropriate.

COUNT II – VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

40.Plaintiff restates and realleges paragraphs 1 through 39 as though fully set forth herein.

41.Plaintiff is a “consumer” as defined by FDCPA §1692a(3).

42.Defendant is a “debt collector” as defined by §1692a(6) because its primary business is the collection of delinquent debts and it regularly collects debts and uses the mail and/or the telephones to collect delinquent accounts allegedly owed to a third party.

43.Moreover, Defendant is a “debt collector” because it acquired rights to the debt after it was in default. 15 U.S.C. §1692a(6).

44. The debt in which Defendant attempting to collect upon is a “debt” as defined by FDCPA §1692a(5) as it arises out of a transaction due or asserted to be owed or due to another for personal, family, or household purposes.

45. Defendant used the phone to attempt to collect the debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in FDCPA §1692a(2).

46. Defendant’s communications to Plaintiff were made in connection with the collection of the debt.

47. Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. §§1692b(3), c(a)(1), c(b), d, d(5), e, e(10), f, and f(1) through its unlawful debt collection practices on a debt that never belonged to Plaintiff.

a. Violations of FDCPA § 1692b

48. Defendant violated §1692b(3) by contacting Plaintiff on a number of occasions seeking to collect upon a debt that wasn’t owed by Plaintiff. Plaintiff repeatedly advised Defendant that it was not her debt, so Defendant had more than enough information to know that the number it was calling was the wrong person. Armed with this knowledge, Defendant still continued to call Plaintiff’s cellular phone multiple times without her prior consent.

b. Violations of FDCPA § 1692c

49. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(1) and c(b) when it continuously called Plaintiff after being notified to stop on multiple occasions. This repeated behavior

of continuously and systematically calling Plaintiff's cellular phone over and over after she demanded that it cease contacting her was harassing and abusive. Even after being told to stop contacting her, Defendant continued its onslaught of phone calls with the specific goal of oppressing and abusing Plaintiff into paying a debt that she did not legally owe.

50. Furthermore, Defendant has relentlessly called Plaintiff on no less than 11 occasions. This volume of calls shows that Defendant willfully ignored Plaintiff's pleas with the goal of annoying and harassing her into submission.

51. Defendant was repeatedly notified by Plaintiff that she did not owe the subject debt. As such, Defendant knew that its conduct was inconvenient, unwanted, and distressing to her.

c. Violations of FDCPA § 1692d

52. Defendant violated § 1692d by engaging in abusive, harassing, and oppressive conduct by relentlessly calling Plaintiff's cellular phone seeking immediate payment on a debt that did not belong to her. Moreover, Defendant continued placing the relentless calls after Plaintiff put Defendant on notice that she is not, and has never been, the owner of the subject debt, and demanded that the calls cease on multiple occasions.

53. Defendant violated § 1692d(5) by causing Plaintiff's cellular phone to ring repeatedly and continuously in an attempt to engage Plaintiff in conversations

regarding the collection of a debt not owed by Plaintiff, with the intent to annoy, abuse, or harass Plaintiff. Specifically, Defendant placed or caused to be placed no less than 11 harassing phone calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone from February 2018 through the present day, using an ATDS without her prior consent, with calls taking place on back to back days and multiple times in one day.

d. Violations of FDCPA § 1692e

54. Defendant violated § 1692e and e(10) when it used deceptive means to collect and/or attempt to collect the alleged debt. Defendant repeatedly contacted the wrong party seeking to collect upon a debt. Even after being apprised of its unlawful acts, Defendant continued its harassing behavior by calling Plaintiff at least 11 times in a deceptive attempt to force her to answer its calls and ultimately make a payment, even though the debt did not belong to her. Through its conduct, Defendant misleadingly represented to Plaintiff that it had the legal ability to contact her via an automated system when it never had consent to do so in the first place.

e. Violations of FDCPA § 1692f

55. Defendant violated § 1692f and f(1) when it unfairly and unconscionably attempted to collect on a debt by continuously calling Plaintiff knowing that the debt was not hers. By doing this, Defendant attempted to browbeat Plaintiff into making a payment that she did not legally owe. By placing voluminous phone calls after becoming privy to the fact that it is contacting the wrong person is unfair and

unconscionable behavior. These means employed by Defendant only served to worry and confuse Plaintiff.

56. Defendant had enough information to be aware of the fact that it was calling the wrong person. Nevertheless, it persisted with its phone call campaign in contacting the wrong individual, and knew that its conduct was inconvenient and harassing to Plaintiff.

57. As an experienced debt collector, Defendant knew or should have known the ramifications of collecting on a debt through incessant harassing phone calls to the cellular phones of consumers that do not legally owe such debt.

58. Upon information and belief, Defendant systematically attempts to collect debts through harassing conduct and has no procedures in place to assure compliance with the FDCPA.

59. As stated above, Plaintiff was severely harmed by Defendant's conduct.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff TANISHA C. BURTON respectfully requests that this Honorable Court:

- a. Declare that the practices complained of herein are unlawful and violate the aforementioned statute;
- b. Award Plaintiff statutory and actual damages, in an amount to be determined at trial, for the underlying FDCPA violations;
- c. Award Plaintiff costs and reasonable attorney fees as provided under 15 U.S.C. §1692k; and
- d. Award any other relief as the Honorable Court deems just and proper.

Dated: September 21, 2018

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Alexander J. Taylor
Alexander J. Taylor, Esq.
Counsel for Plaintiff
Sulaiman Law Group, Ltd
2500 S Highland Ave, Ste 200
Lombard, IL 60148
Telephone: (331) 307-7646
ataylor@sulaimanlaw.com